

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the present application is requested.

Claim 1 stands rejected as anticipated by Pouilloux. However, after a review of that patent, Applicant does not agree.

At the bottom of page 2 of the Official action it is alleged that Pouilloux discloses that the cords are parallel from bead to bead, citing column 2, lines 3-54 of Pouilloux. However, the cord "parallel" does not appear there or anywhere else in the patent.

Pouilloux does say, at column 4, lines 1-4 that fig. 3 depicts the cord "prior to the shaping operation". It will be apparent to those skilled in the art that after a typical shaping operation, during which the tire assumes a toroidal shape, the cord sections are no longer parallel. There is no suggestion in Pouilloux that the description at column 4, lines 1-4 does not apply to all embodiments disclosed by Pouilloux. Accordingly, it is submitted that claim 1 distinguishes patentably over Pouilloux.

New dependent claims 16-18 have been added. New claim 16 recites that the U-shaped connections are free of circumferentially extending portions, and new claim 17 recites that the U-shaped connections are continuously curved. Support for those claims can be found in Fig. 7 for example, showing the continuously curved U-shaped connections 11 that are free of circumferentially extending portions. In contrast, the corresponding connections of Pouilloux intentionally include circumferentially extending portions (see the circumferentially extending portions shown on the attached marked-up copy of Pouilloux's Fig. 4) in order to function as the tire's bead reinforcement (see column 2, lines 20-25, 29 and 31).

Accordingly, it is submitted that each of claims 16 and 17 distinguishes patentably over Pouilloux. The present description has been amended on page 10 to provide the necessary antecedent basis for the language used in claims 16 and 17, such language merely describing what is shown in the original figures (e.g., Fig. 7).

New claim 18 recites the presence of bead wires which are not present in Pouilloux since the carcass reinforcement cords form the bead reinforcement as indicated above. (The claimed bead wires are shown, for example, at 20 in Fig. 11b of the present application.) Accordingly, it is submitted that claim 18 distinguishes patentably over Pouilloux.

In light of the foregoing, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC

Date: December 28, 2007

By:


Alan E. Kopecki
Registration No. 25813

P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, VA 22313-1404
703 836 6620